

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1 - 14 and 16 - 20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 - 4, 7, 9 - 10, and 14 have been amended. Claim 15 has been canceled. New claims 18-20 have been added. No new matter has been added.

§112 Rejection

Claims 1 - 13 have been rejected under §112, second paragraph, for lack of clarity. Specifically, the terms 'high temperature' and 'low temperature' are deemed indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The terms, 'high temperature melt integrity' and 'low temperature shutdown properties,' are discussed in the specification. 'High temperature melt integrity' is set forth at pages 4-5 wherein it is stated:

"High temperature melt integrity means that the separator will substantially maintain its dimensional stability and strength up to a temperature of at least 200°C, and preferably to about 380°C."

'Low temperature shutdown properties' is set forth at page 5 wherein it is stated:

"Low temperature shutdown means that ion flow between the anode and cathode can be substantially terminated by pore blinding at a temperature below 130°C."

Accordingly, both terms are explained in the specification, so that the skilled man would readily understand their meaning. Therefore, this rejection must be removed.

The \$112, second paragraph against claim 2 is moot in view of the amendments.

Allowed Claims

The Examiner has indicated that: claims 4-6 and 10-12 would be allowable if re-written to overcome the \$112, second paragraph rejection, and claim 15 would be allowable if re-written in independent form.

\$102 Rejection

Independent claim 1 is rejected as anticipated by Zucker. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Zucker discloses a separator for a lead-acid battery comprising: a fibrous layer (column 4, lines 31-45) adhered (column 9, penultimate line - column 10, line 4) to a support layer (column 5, line 30-last line) having openings (column 3, lines 10-14). The adhesive is a polyacrylate hot melt, Rhoplex N-495 (Example 1).

Claims 1-3 distinguish Zucker. Zucker does not mention the adhesives recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claims 1-3 are patentable over Zucker.

\$103 Rejection

Independent claims 1 and 14 are rejected as obvious over Takeuchi in view of Adamson. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Takeuchi discloses a nonwoven laminated to a microporous membrane (column 6, lines 35-60; and column 7, lines 8-21). The lamination process is defined as a "conventional localized heat seal process." Takeuchi does not mention the use of adhesives.

Adamson, on the other hand, suggests that a good adhesive for a separator is a blend of long chain polyacrylic acid with a short chain polyacrylic acid (page 2, lines 28-29).

Amended claim 1 does not mention the adhesives suggested by Adamson.

Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are obvious over the combination of Takeuchi in view of Adamson.

The remaining rejections are directed to dependent claims which depend from allowed or allowable independent claims. Thus, those rejections are now moot.

Conclusion

In view of this amendment to the application, any fees due may be charged to Deposit Account 08-2447.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests an early Notice of Allowance in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert H. Hammer III
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,764

Customer No. 29494
Hammer & Hanf, P.C.
3125 Springbank Lane
Suite G
Charlotte, NC 28226
Telephone: 704-927-0400
Facsimile: 704-927-0485

H:\2000\120\Amend020106.doc